



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAIL

JUL 20 2005

DIRECTOR OFFICE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 DIAGONAL ROAD
SUITE 370
ALEXANDRIA VA 22314

In re Application of: Morishita, et al.
Application No. 10/783,018
Filed: February 23, 2004
For: REMOTE COPY SYSTEM

DECISION ON PETITION
TO MAKE SPECIAL
(ACCELERATED EXAMINATION)
UNDER M.P.E.P. §708.02 (VIII)

This is a response to the renewed petition filed 17 June 2005 and to the supplemental petition filed 16 May 2005, under 37 C.F.R. §1.102(d) and M.P.E.P. §708.02 (VIII): Accelerated Examination, to make the above-identified application special.


On 16 May 2005, a decision was mailed dismissing applicants' petition filed 28 January 2005 under 37 C.F.R. §1.102(d) and M.P.E.P. §708.02 (VIII): Accelerated Examination, to make the above-identified application special. The petition was dismissed for failing to meet requirement (e).

On 16 May 2005, applicants filed a supplemental petition to the petition filed 28 January 2005.

On 17 June 2005, applicants filed a renewed petition in response to the dismissal of the original petition filed 28 January 2005.

The renewed petition filed 17 June 2005 identifies a feature of each independent claim (i.e., a first feature of independent claim 1, . . . , a fourth feature of independent claim 10). Although, in identifying this feature, the discussion states that the references "fail to disclose or suggest [the identified feature] *in combination* with the other limitations recited in the claims" (emphasis added) and although it is also stated in the discussion of each reference that the reference "does not disclose or suggest" the identified feature for each independent claim "*in combination* with the other limitations recited in each of the independent claims" (emphasis added), the supplemental petition filed 16 May 2005 (pages 4-6) states that the references fail to teach or suggest these features (The features are not identified as first, second, third, and fourth in the supplemental petition. However, the distinguishing features set forth in the supplemental petition are identical to those identified as first, second, third, and fourth in the renewed petition.) without reference to the combination of limitations in the claims. This statement in the supplemental petition on pages 4-6 is sufficient. Accordingly, the petition is **GRANTED**.

The application file is being forwarded to the Examiner of Record for accelerated examination according to the procedures set forth in MPEP § 708.02, Section VIII.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Pinchus M. Laufer", is written over a horizontal line.

Pinchus M. Laufer
Special Program Examiner
Technology Center 2100
Computer Architecture, Software and Information Security
571-272-3599

ds